

## Radiology GW Class Homework for Class 4

Due 2/16/2010

1. Revise your Specific Aims based on feedback you have received to date.
2. Get written feedback from your mentor or another senior investigator in your field. This person needs to have subject-specific expertise and success in grant writing and, ideally, also would have experience in grant review.

Written feed back can take one of several forms, such as:

- a. Mentor fills in the template on page 2 of this document, which you return to JSR with your revised aims.
  - b. Mentor provides comments written directly on a copy of your Specific Aims, either in long hand on a hard copy (in which case, scan and send to JSR) or entered into an e-copy (MS Track Changes function or similar)
  - c. You take notes during a discussion with the mentor about the Specific Aims, covering points in the attached template, and send notes to JSR.
3. Send revised specific aims and written feedback on the aims from your mentor or another senior investigator to JSR by 2/16/10 (2 days prior to our next class).
  4. Revise your idea statement to prepare for in-class discussion on 2/18; focus on clearly stating the fundamental questions driving your proposal. You do not need to return this statement to JSR prior to class.

**Template for mentor's review Radiology Grant Writing Class: February, 2010**

**Do the specific aims:**

1. Begin with an introduction that tells you why the aims are being done? Does the idea behind the proposal come through?
  
2. Seem specific and focused, or broad and fuzzy? (Aims should be specific enough to allow a knowledgeable person to visualize one or more experiments, tests, or interventions that will accomplish the aim.)
  
3. Avoid vague terms such as "describe the process of . . ." , "characterize the phenomenon of . . ." , or "elucidate mechanisms for . . ."
  
4. State hypotheses where appropriate? Are the hypotheses a stretch or a good fit? (Technically oriented imaging grants do not always lend themselves to stating hypotheses.)
  
5. Seem clearly related to each other?
  
6. Avoid being a fishing expedition (i.e., avoid collecting data with no clear indication of how it will be used)? Does the P.I limit himself/herself to 3 or 4 aims?
  
7. Present a doable body of work, rather than being too broad or ambitious?